

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,209	06/20/2003	Dhananjay V. Keskar	42P16126	9022
8791 7590 10/16/2007 BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN 1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY			EXAMINER	
			SMITH, CREIGHTON H	
SUNNYVALE	E, CA 94085-4040		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2614	
		•	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
		•	10/16/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/600,209	KESKAR ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Creighton H. Smith	2614			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u>_</u> .				
· <u> </u>	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10 and 12-24 is/are pending in the a 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10 & 12-24 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct and the contract of the contrac	epted or b) objected to by the liderawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive I (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary				
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Date of Informal P 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/600,209

Art Unit: 2614

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1- 10, 12-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bork et al in view of O'Neil et al, U.S. Patent Publication #2004/0224693.

Bork's wireless communication device has an intelligent alerting system, col. 3, lines 34-36. The wireless device has an alerting system that is determined from the operating environment. The terminal's CPU will adjust the audio, visual, and tactile alerting signals based on the operating environment. Bork et al disclose a few examples of a user's "physical context information" in col. 2, lines 4-6 & 57-65, where Bork discloses that the wireless device samples the <u>noise level</u> surrounding the terminal and other inputs such as light sensing, temperature sensing, motion sensing and the date. Bork's light, temperature, and motion sensing inputs reads upon applicant's "physical context information" and Bork's real time clock including date reads upon applicant's "location information". Also see col. 6, lines 53-60; col. 7, lines 53-61. Bork et al also disclose a real time clock **202** (including date) – col. 9, lines 42 et seq. The date, i.e., the time of day, is used to establish an alert based upon the time of day. The "date" and "time of day" disclosed by Bork et al reads upon applicant's location information.

Bork et al fail to disclose that schedule information is one of the inputs that is going into their alerting system. However, O'Neil et al do disclose in ¶-0076 that the Personal

Application/Control Number: 10/600,209

Art Unit: 2614

Information Manager keeps a calendar for the customer notifying him/her of appointments, meetings, deadlines, etc. To have incorporated O'Neil et al teaching of using a calendar/scheduling information as part of the alerting/notifying means in Bork et al wireless device would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art because both Bork et al and O'Neil et al are disclosing different input means that are used to generate alerts in wireless, mobile devices, and the skilled practitioner in the wireless arts with these two references in front of her would have found them readily combinable because of the fact that different inputs are being used to generate the alerts in Bork et al than in O'Neil but common sense would show that the alerts of either reference could easily be used in the other reference.

For claim 2, Bork et al disclose in col. 2, line 7, that the wireless device will modify its notification behavior by generating either a tactile (vibrating), or visual signal. This meets applicant's limitations of claim 2 of a flashing display screen and a blinking LED.

Concerning claim 4, Bork et al disclose in col. 2, lines 35 et seq. that one of the physical pieces of information is passive audible sensing of the environment which meets applicant's limitation in claim 4 of "ambient noise information." In lines 56 et seq. of col. 2, Bork discloses some other physical pieces of information that affect the alerting signal in the wireless device are: light sensing, temperature sensing, and motion sensing.

For claim 18, see Bork et al cols. 10-11, lines 65-67 & 1-4.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Creighton H. Smith at telephone number 571/272-7546.

Application/Control Number: 10/600,209

Art Unit: 2614

09 OCT '07

Page 4

Creighton H Smith Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2614